### **SECTION: REMARKS**

This reply is submitted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §132 and 37 C.F.R. §1.111. The Office Action was carefully considered by the undersigned attorney and applicant. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

# 1. Summary of the Office Action.

Claims 1-38 were pending.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-6, 13, 14, 16-20, 27, 28 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over Stratford et al (4,143,794)

Claims 8, 15, 22 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) over Stratford et al

Claims 7, 9-12, 21, and 23-26 were objected to but found to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 30-37 were allowed.

### 2. Discussion.

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the finding of allowable subject matter in this application.

### Claim Rejection(s) - 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 38. This claim was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. The claim has been amended to correct the unclear language. The claim particularly points out and distinctly claims

the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

## Claim Rejection(s) - 35 USC §102-103

- Claim 1. This claim was rejected under 35 USC 102 over Stratford. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 7. Claim 7 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim (and intervening claims 5 and 6). The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicants note amended claim 1 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 7, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 7 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent claims 5-7 are cancelled in view of this amendment.
- Claim 16. This claim was rejected under 35 USC 102 over Stratford. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 21. Claim 21 was objected to, but was found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim (and intervening claim 20). The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. Applicants note amended claim 16 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 21, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 21 is intended or should be considered made. Dependent claims 20 and 21 are cancelled in view of this amendment.
- Claim 39. This independent claim is new. The claim is based on independent claim 1 as filed and incorporates all of the elements of objected to dependent claim 9, which was found to contain

allowable subject matter by the examiner. Accordingly, the claim is believed to be patentable. Applicants note that new claim 39 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 9, merely rewritten in independent form. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 9 is intended or should be considered made.

- Claim 40. This independent claim is new. The claim is based on independent claim 16 as filed and incorporates all of the elements of objected to dependent claim 23, which was found to contain allowable subject matter by the examiner. Accordingly, the claim is believed to be patentable.

  Applicants note that new claim 40 is a version of originally submitted dependent claim 23, merely rewritten in independent form.. Thus, no limiting amendment is made and no limitation on the scope of the language of dependent claim 23 is intended or should be considered made.
- Claim 38. This claim was rejected under 35 USC 102 over Stratford. Applicant amended the claim to incorporate all of the limitations of dependent claim 9 regarding the burp valve connected to the cap. The amended claim is believed to be patentable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.
- Remaining Claims. The remaining dependent claims each adds at least one limitation to the elements of its base claim, and is therefore deemed to be allowable with such base and any intervening claim, at least for this reason. Amendments were made to some of these claims in view of the amendments to the base claims, rejections, and/or cancellation of claims.

#### 3. Conclusion.

The claims pending after this amendment are believed to be patentable for the reasons stated above. The amendments are believed to be supported by the specification, claims and drawings as filed. It is believed that this case is now in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that telephone communication would advance the prosecution of this case to finality, he is invited to call at the number below.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a), provided a Petition is not submitted separately.

Please charge any fee due not paid by a check or credit card provided herewith, and/or charge any underpayment in any fee, and/or credit any overpayment in fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-2381.

Any fees due are calculated as follows:	Number	<u>Fee</u>
TOTAL claims remaining over that previously paid for:	None	\$0
INDEPENDENT claims remaining over that previously paid for:	None	\$0
SUM	claim fees:	\$0
EXTENSION fees:		\$0
OTHER fees:		\$0
TOTAL AMOUNT (if any)		\$0
[ ] Paid by enclosed check.		
[ ] Paid by enclosed Credit Card Payment Form(s) PTO-2038.		

Respectfully submitted,

2-3-06

Joel D. Skinner, Jr. Reg. No. 33,786

Skinner and Associates 212 Commercial Street Hudson, Wisconsin 54016

Tel.: (715) 386-5800 FAX: (715) 386-6177

cc: Dr. Mark Anderson (For Records)
G:\CLIENTS\Genesis-MAI-Anderson-GEN\Dispenser Container (264USA)\OA Reply.doc